

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

ABANTE ROOTER AND)	Case No.
PLUMBING, individually and on)	
behalf of all others similarly situated,)	<u>CLASS ACTION</u>
)	
Plaintiff,)	COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS
)	OF:
vs.)	
)	1. NEGLIGENT VIOLATIONS OF
)	THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER
)	PROTECTION ACT [47 U.S.C.
STRAIGHT MARKETING LLC;)	§227 ET SEQ.]
DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,)	2. WILLFUL VIOLATIONS OF THE
)	TELEPHONE CONSUMER
)	PROTECTION ACT [47 U.S.C.
Defendants.)	§227 ET SEQ.]
)	
)	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff, ABANTE ROOTER AND PLUMBING (“Plaintiff”), individually and all others similarly situated, alleges the following upon information and belief based upon personal knowledge:

NATURE OF THE CASE

1. Plaintiff brings this action individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated seeking damages and any other available legal or equitable remedies resulting from the illegal actions of STRAIGHT MARKETING LLC (“Defendant”), in negligently, knowingly, and/or willfully contacting Plaintiff on

1 Plaintiff's cellular telephone in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection
2 Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 *et seq.* ("TCPA"), thereby invading Plaintiff's privacy.

3 **JURISDICTION & VENUE**

4 2. Jurisdiction is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2) because Plaintiff,
5 a resident of California, seeks relief on behalf of a Class, which will result in at
6 least one class member belonging to a different state than that of Defendant, a New
7 Jersey limited liability company. Plaintiff also seeks up to \$1,500.00 in damages
8 for each call in violation of the TCPA, which, when aggregated among a proposed
9 class in the thousands, exceeds the \$5,000,000.00 threshold for federal court
10 jurisdiction. Therefore, both diversity jurisdiction and the damages threshold under
11 the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005 ("CAFA") are present, and this Court has
12 jurisdiction.

13 3. Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the Northern
14 District of California pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 1391(b) and 18 U.S.C. § 1441(a)
15 because Defendant does business within the state of California and Plaintiff resides
16 within this District.

17 **PARTIES**

18 4. Plaintiff, ABANTE ROOTER AND PLUMBING ("Plaintiff"), is a
19 rooting and plumbing business residing in Alameda County of the state of
20 California and is a "person" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (10).

21 5. Defendant, STRAIGHT MARKETING LLC ("Defendant"), is a
22 digital marketing company and is a "person" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (10).

23 6. The above named Defendant, and its subsidiaries and agents, are
24 collectively referred to as "Defendants." The true names and capacities of the
25 Defendants sued herein as DOE DEFENDANTS 1 through 10, inclusive, are
26 currently unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sues such Defendants by fictitious
27 names. Each of the Defendants designated herein as a DOE is legally responsible
28 for the unlawful acts alleged herein. Plaintiff will seek leave of Court to amend the

1 Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of the DOE Defendants when
2 such identities become known.

3 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes that at all relevant times, each and
4 every Defendant was acting as an agent and/or employee of each of the other
5 Defendants and was acting within the course and scope of said agency and/or
6 employment with the full knowledge and consent of each of the other Defendants.
7 Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the acts and/or omissions complained
8 of herein was made known to, and ratified by, each of the other Defendants.

9 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

10 8. Beginning on or around April 6, 2018, Defendant contacted Plaintiff
11 on cellular telephone (510) 540-7210, in an effort to sell or solicit its services.

12 9. When Plaintiff answered the phone it heard a long pause before a
13 clicking noise indicative of an automated telephone dialing system.

14 10. Defendant used an “automatic telephone dialing system”, as defined
15 by 47 U.S.C. § 227(a)(1) to place its daily calls to Plaintiff seeking to sell or solicit
16 its business services. At one or more instance during these calls, Defendant utilized
17 an “artificial or prerecorded voice” as prohibited by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).

18 11. Defendant’s calls constituted calls that were not for emergency
19 purposes as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).

20 12. Defendant’s calls were placed to telephone number assigned to a
21 cellular telephone service for which Plaintiff incurs a charge for incoming calls
22 pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1).

23 13. Plaintiff is not a customer of Defendant’s services and has never
24 provided any personal information, including his cellular telephone number, to
25 Defendant for any purpose whatsoever. Accordingly, Defendant never received
26 Plaintiff’s “prior express consent” to receive calls using an automatic telephone
27 dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice on his cellular telephone
28 pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

14. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, as a member of the proposed class (hereafter “The Class”) defined as follows:

All persons within the United States who received any telephone calls from Defendant to said person’s cellular telephone made through the use of any automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice and such person had not previously consented to receiving such calls within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint through to the date of class certification

15. Plaintiff represents, and is a member of, The Class, consisting of All persons within the United States who received any telephone calls from Defendant to said person’s cellular telephone made through the use of any automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice and such person had not previously not provided their cellular telephone number to Defendant within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint.

16. Defendant, its employees and agents are excluded from The Class. Plaintiff does not know the number of members in The Class, but believes the Class members number in the thousands, if not more. Thus, this matter should be certified as a Class Action to assist in the expeditious litigation of the matter.

17. The Class is so numerous that the individual joinder of all of its members is impractical. While the exact number and identities of The Class members are unknown to Plaintiff at this time and can only be ascertained through appropriate discovery, Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that The Class includes thousands of members. Plaintiff alleges that The Class members may be ascertained by the records maintained by Defendant.

18. Plaintiff and members of The Class were harmed by the acts of

1 Defendant in at least the following ways: Defendant illegally contacted Plaintiff
2 and Class members via their cellular telephones thereby causing Plaintiff and Class
3 members to incur certain charges or reduced telephone time for which Plaintiff and
4 Class members had previously paid by having to retrieve or administer messages
5 left by Defendant during those illegal calls, and invading the privacy of said
6 Plaintiff and Class members.

7 19. Common questions of fact and law exist as to all members of The
8 Class which predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of
9 The Class. These common legal and factual questions, which do not vary between
10 Class members, and which may be determined without reference to the individual
11 circumstances of any Class members, include, but are not limited to, the following:

- 12
- 13 a. Whether, within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint,
14 Defendant made any call (other than a call made for emergency purposes
15 or made with the prior express consent of the called party) to a Class
16 member using any automatic telephone dialing system or any artificial or
17 prerecorded voice to any telephone number assigned to a cellular
18 telephone service;
 - 19 b. Whether Plaintiff and the Class members were damages thereby, and the
20 extent of damages for such violation; and
 - 21 c. Whether Defendant should be enjoined from engaging in such conduct in
22 the future.

23 20. As a person that received numerous calls from Defendant using an
24 automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice, without
25 Plaintiff's prior express consent, Plaintiff is asserting claims that are typical of The
26 Class.

27 21. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the members
28 of The Class. Plaintiff has retained attorneys experienced in the prosecution of
class actions.

22. A class action is superior to other available methods of fair and

efficient adjudication of this controversy, since individual litigation of the claims of all Class members is impracticable. Even if every Class member could afford individual litigation, the court system could not. It would be unduly burdensome to the courts in which individual litigation of numerous issues would proceed. Individualized litigation would also present the potential for varying, inconsistent, or contradictory judgments and would magnify the delay and expense to all parties and to the court system resulting from multiple trials of the same complex factual issues. By contrast, the conduct of this action as a class action presents fewer management difficulties, conserves the resources of the parties and of the court system, and protects the rights of each Class member.

23. The prosecution of separate actions by individual Class members would create a risk of adjudications with respect to them that would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of the other Class members not parties to such adjudications or that would substantially impair or impede the ability of such non-party Class members to protect their interests.

24. Defendant has acted or refused to act in respects generally applicable to The Class, thereby making appropriate final and injunctive relief with regard to the members of the California Class as a whole.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Negligent Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act 47 U.S.C. §227 et seq.

25. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference into this cause of action the allegations set forth above at Paragraphs 1-23.

26. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous and multiple negligent violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each and every one of the above cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.

27. As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq., Plaintiff and the Class Members are entitled to an award of \$500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §

1 227(b)(3)(B).

2 28. Plaintiff and the Class members are also entitled to and seek
3 injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

4 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **Knowing and/or Willful Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection
6 Act**

7 **47 U.S.C. §227 et seq.**

8 29. Plaintiff repeats and incorporates by reference into this cause of
9 action the allegations set forth above at Paragraphs 1-23.

10 30. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous
11 and multiple knowing and/or willful violations of the TCPA, including but not
12 limited to each and every one of the above cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et
13 seq.

14 31. As a result of Defendant's knowing and/or willful violations of 47
15 U.S.C. § 227 et seq., Plaintiff and the Class members are entitled to an award of
16 \$1,500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C.
17 § 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).

18 32. Plaintiff and the Class members are also entitled to and seek
19 injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

20 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

21 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests judgment against Defendant for the following:

22 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

23 **Negligent Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act**

24 **47 U.S.C. §227 et seq.**

- 25 • As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of 47 U.S.C.
26 §227(b)(1), Plaintiff and the Class members are entitled to and
27 request \$500 in statutory damages, for each and every violation,
28 pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 227(b)(3)(B); and

- Any and all other relief that the Court deems just and proper.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

Knowing and/or Willful Violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act

47 U.S.C. §227 et seq.

- As a result of Defendant's willful and/or knowing violations of 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(1), Plaintiff and the Class members are entitled to and request treble damages, as provided by statute, up to \$1,500, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(3)(C); and

- Any and all other relief that the Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully Submitted this 10th day of August, 2020.

LAW OFFICES OF TODD M. FRIEDMAN, P.C.

By: /s Todd M. Friedman
Todd M. Friedman
Law Offices of Todd M. Friedman
Attorney for Plaintiff